

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

I. PRIOR ART MATTERS.

- A. The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanabe. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

A single prior art reference anticipates a claimed invention only if it discloses each and every claim element.¹

As to amended claim 1, Tanabe does not disclose: a full flow filtration structure operably connected in said internal flow path, said full flow filtration structure filtering a major portion of the fluid, and a bypass filtration structure interposed in said internal flow path, said bypass filtration structure filtering a minor portion of the fluid.

Claim 1 is therefore allowable.

- B. The Office Action rejected claim 1 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Hacker. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As to amended claim 1, Hacker does not disclose: a full flow filtration structure operably connected in said internal flow path, said full flow filtration structure filtering a major portion of the fluid, and a by pass filtration structure interposed in said internal flow path, said bypass filtration structure filtering a minor portion of the fluid.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of all claims and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance.


¹ *Structural Rubber Prod. Co. v. Park Rubber Co.*, 749 F.2d 707, 223 USPQ 1264 (Fed. Cir. 1984)

Applicant would like to notify the Examiner that rejections on other prior art are outstanding in the parent case of the instant application, U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/815,938, "Fluid Filtration Apparatus", filed March 22, 2001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 30 June 03

By


Gerald E. Helget (Reg. No. 30,948)
Nelson R. Capes (Reg. No. 37,106)
Briggs and Morgan, P.A.
2200 IDS Center
80 South Eighth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 977-8480